

## **PUSH AND PULL MOTIVATION OF YOUNG TOURIST FOR VISITING CITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA**

*Milena Podovac<sup>1</sup>; Melita Jovanović-Tončev<sup>2</sup>*

### **Abstract**

*This study analyzes the motivation of young tourists for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. The applied method is a survey, which was conducted on a sample of 111 respondents. The primary goal of this study was to examine the push and pull factors of young tourists for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia as well as their overall satisfaction. The results of empirical study showed that the main push factors of young tourists are: spending time with friends, having fun, rest and relaxation, new experiences and getting away from stress and daily routine. The main pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia according to the answers of respondents are: cleanliness and orderliness of the city, good value for money of the services provided, cultural and historical heritage sites, rich gastronomy offer and additional facilities. In addition, the results indicate that there is not a statistically significant difference between young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics about their push and pull factors as well as overall satisfaction with their visit to the cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

**Key Words:** *youth tourism, young tourists, cities, motivation, push factors, pull factors*

**JEL classification:** *Z30, Z32, L83*

### **Introduction**

In an era full of challenges for the tourism industry (Ghețe, 2015), youth tourism is one of the fastest growing segments in the international tourism market (Horak & Weber, 2000; Khoshpakyants & Vidishcheva, 2010; Han

---

<sup>1</sup> Milena Podovac, PhD, Teaching Assistant, University of Kragujevac Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, Vojvođanska bb, 36-210 Vrnjačka Banja, Serbia, phone: + 381 36 515 00 24, e-mail: milena.podovac@kg.ac.rs

<sup>2</sup> Melita Jovanović Tončev, PhD, Trade school, Hilendarska 1, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, phone: +381 063 72 73 492, e-mail: melitajt93@gmail.com

et al., 2017). Under the influence of globalization trends, with an excess of free time and the fragmentation of holidays, changes in tourism demand occurred causing intense development of production forces and directly affecting the rise in the living standard of the population. The modern tourist is characterized by an increased tourist experience, striving for authentic experiences, as well as a demand for products of higher quality that provide good value for money (Jovanović Tončev et al., 2016). Bearing in mind that tourism contributes to meeting different cultures (Podovac et al., 2019), young tourists are in the focus of the contemporary tourism development as a market segment, which is growing significantly. Youth tourism is defined as independent travel, which refers to trips taken by young people independently, without being accompanied by a parent or guardian (Demeter & Bratucu, 2014). Youth tourism implies individuals between 15 and 29 years of age, who, because of their limited budget, use affordable means of transport such as bus and rail and they stay in hostels and low-cost hotels (Todorović et al., 2015). The limited budget does not prevent young tourists from undergoing new experiences and meeting their tourist needs during their stay at the destination.

This paper presents the results of an empirical study of the motivation of young tourists for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia, which is based on the push-pull motivation theory. The aim of this study is contributing to the current findings about push factors, which encourage young tourists to visit cities in the Republic of Serbia, as well as pull factors regarding the elements of cities' tourist offer which are attractive for young tourists. Based on a review of relevant literature and similar researches, a questionnaire was developed by which an empirical research was conducted. The paper also presents and analyzes the results of the research that the conclusions are based on.

### **Literature review**

Motivation in tourism is a complex field of research (Cohen, 1972; Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981; Gnoth, 1997; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Weber et al., 2012; Wen et al., 2018; Carvache-Franco et al., 2018). Authors have focused particular attention on the study of tourism motivation during the 1960s (Wong et al., 2013) whereby the history of tourism motivation research developed in parallel with consumer behavior research (Gnoth, 1997). The analysis of theoretical knowledge of the motivations and behavior of tourists primarily involves defining the concepts of motivation and motive (Jovanović Tončev & Podovac, 2016).

Motivation is the result of individuals' thinking about certain activities that can potentially create pleasure, so going to the places where they can be found is the basic driving force which manages behavior during travel (Iso-Ahola, 1982). Motivation as an internal drive that guides a person's behavior and decision making has been examined in relation to work, sport, travel and other leisure time activities (Šimková & Holznelr, 2014). Motivation is associated with psychological and biological needs and wishes, and includes generated integral powers, directing and integrating the behavior and activity of a particular person (Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

From the perspective of tourism, the nature of motivation is multidimensional. Tourists want to experience more than one attribute in a destination which is why the subject of the research must be variables of two sets: destination attributes and travel motives (Pyo et al., 1989). On the other hand, motive is defined as internal factor that encourages, directs and integrates the behavior in certain people (Murray, 1964, p. 7). Due to the fact that tourist destinations are amalgam of tourist products (Buhalis, 2000), motives for travel and stay of tourists in a certain destination can be multiple wherefore tourists can satisfy a large number of their tourist needs and motives in one trip.

Several theories of motivation have been presented in the literature, which are applicable in the study of tourists' motivation. In his research, Plog (1974) developed psychographic motivation theory, according to which tourist are classified according to their personal characteristics, life-style and personal values to psychocentrics and allocentrics (Šimková & Holzner, 2014). Psychocentrics are represented by people concerned with their own affairs, i.e. non adventurous visitors, who often require standard services, while allocentrics are independent tourists seeking for adventure or experience (Prasad et al., 2019). Plog found that there were certain laws regarding the profile of people visiting the destination and patterns of growth and decline of the destination in the market. The main reason is that changes in the character of most destinations are the result of the growth and development of tourist facilities and services (Plog, 1974). In his research, Iso Ahola (1982), defined a two-dimensional leisure motivation theory, which includes two elements: escaping (routine, stress, familiar environment, everyday problems, stress at work) and seeking for a certain kind of personal reward.

In analyzing tourists' motivation, numerous authors (Shin et al., 2017; Marchiori & Cantoni, 2018; Sari et al., 2019) refer to Maslow's hierarchy

of needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs includes five levels of needs: physiological needs, security and safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs and self-actualization needs). According to his theory, fulfilment of one need leads to another on a higher level, thus forming a hierarchy (Yousaf et. al., 2018). One of the most used motivation theories in tourism is the push-pull motivation theory which explains motives and behavior of tourists during the decision-making process on visiting a particular destination and motives that attract them to visit the same (Dann, 1977; Azman & Chan, 2010; Kim et al., 2003; Kim & Baum, 2007; Antara & Prameswari, 2018). Push factors are more related to internal or emotional aspects and they can be seen as the desire for escape, rest and relaxation, adventure, social interaction and family togetherness. Pull factors are connected with external or cognitive aspects and they are inspired by a destination's attractiveness, such as beaches, recreation facilities, cultural attractions, entertainment, natural scenery, shopping and parks (Yoon & Uysal, 2005, p. 46-47). These factors can be characterized as factors that drive or deter an individual from making the decision to travel to the particular destination (Salimon, et al., 2019). The push-pull theory implies that a man is driven by the decision to take trips with internal forces and drawn by external forces, or by attributes of destinations (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994).

Considering the subject of research in this study, it is important to consider the motivation of young tourists to visit cities as well as factors that *influence the decision making for staying in the cities*, but also elements of their tourist offer which attract young tourists to stay in cities. In the study of motivational factors of young tourists visiting Belgrade as tourist destination, Todorović and Jovičić (2016) concluded that young tourists primarily travel to Belgrade to have fun, visit interesting sites, get away from the routine and feel excitement. On the other hand, the main pull factors, which attract young people to visit Belgrade are the contact with local residents and cultural attractions and sightseeing which are rated as more important than going out at night and visiting events. Preko et al. (2018) analyzed the push and pull motives and behavioral intentions of young tourists who visited Ghana. On the example of 557 respondents, authors identified that key push factors that encourage young people to stay in Ghana are: rest/relaxation, knowledge seeking, novelty and ego-enhancement. Based on the respondents' answers, the authors identified key pull factors that attracted young tourists to Ghana as: historical-cultural attractions, accessibility-good value, natural-ecological heritage and service delivery. On the sample of visitors between 15 to 35 years old, that

visited the archaeological site of Delphi in Greece, Boukas (2013) found that young tourists are important consumers of culture. In addition, research conducted by this author has shown that young tourists are satisfied with attributes such as cultural monuments, landscapes and experience, while less satisfied with anthropogenic resources such as facilities, amenities and operational features. Wangari (2017) has applied push-pull motivation theory in research visitors of young tourists between 15 to 30 years of age, who visited a national park in Nairobi (Kenya). Research results showed that push factors are a more important determinant of youth travel to Kenya than pull factors. While such factors may, to some great extent, be outside the control of tourism marketers, the industry can provide products and services to match this market expectations and aspirations.

An analysis of the available scientific literature has highlighted the complexity of tourists' motivation in making the decision to travel and stay in a particular destination. Although there are a large number of motivational theories in the literature, the most applicable in the study of tourists' behavior is certainly the push-pull motivational theory, which allows identifying the factors that influence the tourist in different stages of planning and realization of the tourist trip.

### **Research methodology**

In order to examine the factors which encourage young tourists to visit cities in the Republic of Serbia, as well as pull factors regarding the elements of cities' tourist offer which are attractive for young tourists, the survey was conducted from 20 January to 20 February 2020. Designing the questionnaire implied previous analysis of empirical research studies with similar subject (Matzler & Siller, 2003; Kim & Jogaratnam, 2007; Todorović & Jovičić, 2016; Preko et al., 2018). This analysis has enabled defining research questions and hypotheses, which have been verified using appropriate statistical tests (t-test of independent samples and one-way analysis of variance).

The questionnaire included 13 questions, which are divided into three segments. The first part of the questionnaire includes questions related to the basic socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (gender, age, education and professional status). Second part of the questionnaire includes questions about the characteristics of trip of young tourists and their future intentions about visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. In the third part of the questionnaire, respondents rated importance of push and

pull factors using the 5-point Likert scale. Respondents were asked about the level of satisfaction and impact of visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia on their personal values. The questionnaire was based on the similar research study (Todorović & Jovičić, 2016; Wangari, 2017; Preko et al., 2018.). The survey sample included young people between 18 to 29 years old. The questionnaire was completed by 111 respondents. Analysis of the data was performed in the SPSS 26 software.

In line with the aims of this paper, the following hypotheses were defined:

**H1: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.**

*H1a: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different gender concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H1b: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H1c: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different education concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H1d: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different professional status concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

**H2: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.**

*H2a: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different gender concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H2b: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H2c: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different education concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H2d: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different professional status concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

**H3: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.**

*H3a: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different gender concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H3b: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H3c: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different education concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

*H3d: There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different professional status concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia.*

**Research results and discussion**

In study of the push and pull factors of young tourists for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia, 111 respondents participated. Table 1 presents data on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1: *Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (n=111)*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	25	22.5	1.77	.420
	Female	86	77.5		
<b>Age</b>	18-21	33	29.7	1.86	.667
	22-25	60	54.1		
	26-29	18	16.2		
<b>Level of education</b>	High school	35	31.5	1.86	.694
	Bachelor's degree	56	50.5		
	Master degree	20	18.0		
<b>Professional status</b>	Student	76	68.5	1.40	.636
	Employed	26	23.4		
	Unemployed	9	8.1		
	Other	76	0		

Source: *Research results*

Table 2 shows the answers of the respondents to the questions related to their visit to cities in the Republic of Serbia. Of the total number of respondents, 84 respondents (75.7%) made an overnight stay in the cities

of the Republic of Serbia. By the length of stay, the majority of respondents stayed between 2 to 3 nights (41 respondents or 36.9%). Most of the respondents (75 respondents or 67.6%) used private accommodation during the visit.

Table 2: *Characteristics related to respondents' visit to the cities of Republic of Serbia (n=111)*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Stay</b>	Overnight	84	75.7	1.24	.431
	Transit	27	24.3		
<b>Duration of stay</b>	1 night	29	26.1	2.39	1.153
	2-3 nights	41	36.9		
	4-5 nights	10	9.0		
	Over 5 nights	31	27.9		
<b>Accommodation type</b>	Hotel	32	28.8	2.41	.918
	Hostel	3	2.7		
	Private accommodation	75	67.6		
	Other	1	.9		
<b>City which respondents visited</b>	Belgrade	58	52.3	1.66	.769
	Novi Sad	33	29.7		
	Other	20	18.0		
<b>First visit</b>	Yes	28	25.2	1.75	.436
	No	83	74.8		
<b>Future intentions</b>	Visit again	46	41.4	1.98	.914
	Recommend to other people/encourage other people to visit	22	19.8		
	Pass to other people positive impressions	42	37.8		
	First time in cities of Republic of Serbia	1	.9		

Source: *Research results*

The largest number of respondents (58 respondents or 52.3%) stated that they visited Belgrade, while 33 respondents, or 29.7%, visited Novi Sad. Under the option *Other*, respondents cited other cities including: Paraćin, Kruševac, Arandjelovac, Jagodina, Zaječar and others. Of the total number of respondents, 83 respondents or 74.8% said they did not stay in the cities of the Republic of Serbia for the first time. In terms of future intentions, 46 respondents or 41.4% of the total number of respondents will visit cities of



the Republic of Serbia in the future, while 42 respondents or 37.8% will pass their positive impressions about travel to other people (Table 2).

Table 3: *Push factors (n=111)*

<b>Push factors</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
Rest and relaxation	3.72	1.177
I wanted to get away from stress and daily routine	3.59	1.107
I wanted to have fun	4.00	.963
Acquisition of new knowledge	3.36	1.135
I wanted to learn more about culture and history of the city	3.42	1.180
Spending time with friends	4.11	1.090
Contact with nature	3.41	1.268
I wanted a whole new experience	3.68	1.183
I wanted to visit a city that my friends have never visited	2.87	1.415
I wanted to experience something that I would be able to tell my friends	3.23	1.293
I wanted to make new friends during my stay in the city	3.22	1.268

Source: *Research results*

Average ratings given by the respondents regarding push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia are presented in the Table 3. *Spending time with friends* was the highest rated push factor for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (M=4.11), while the lowest rated push factor was *I wanted to visit a city that my friends have never visited* (M=2.87) (Table 3).

Table 4: *Pull factors (n=111)*

<b>Pull factors</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
Natural attractions	3.50	1.127
Accessibility and developed transport infrastructure	3.76	1.185
Localities of cultural and historical heritage	3.80	1.086
Good value for money services provided	4.02	.953
Quality nightlife (cafes, clubs, etc.)	3.40	1.170
Rich gastronomy offer	3.76	.956
Cleanliness and orderliness of the city (park areas, architectural design city, cleanliness, etc.)	4.04	1.053
Organized city tours accompanied by a licensed tourist guide	3.31	1.256
The quality of the accommodation offer	3.70	1.023
Additional facilities (spa & wellness services, sports and recreational facilities, shopping malls, etc.)	3.74	1.051
The relationship and behavior of the local population according to tourists	3.47	1.127

Source: *Research results*

Average ratings given by the respondents regarding pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia are presented in the Table 4. *Cleanliness and orderliness of the city* (M=4.04) and *good value for money services provided* (M=4.02) were the highest rated pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia, while the lowest rated pull factor is *Organized city tours accompanied by a licensed tourist guide* (M=3.31) (Table 4). With regards to the question about their satisfaction and impact of the visit on their personal values, average ratings given by the respondents are highest for the *I have enjoyed myself on the tour* (M=4.17) and *I am satisfied with the tour* (M=4.09) (Table 5).

Table 5: *Level of respondent's satisfaction and impact of the visit to the cities of Republic of Serbia*

<b>Overall satisfaction</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
The tour helped me to develop my personal values	3.43	1.076
The tour helped me to rediscover my heritage	3.31	1.102
I am satisfied with the tour	4.09	.949
I have enjoyed myself on the tour	4.17	.952
I felt a sense of belonging at the site	3.76	1.081
I felt emotionally involved in the tour	3.97	.986

Source: *Research results*

Furthermore, an independent sample t-test was applied to examine the existence of a statistically significant difference between young tourists of different gender about their push factors, pull factors and overall satisfaction by visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between:

- young tourists of different gender about their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H1a was rejected).
- young tourists of different gender about their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H2a was rejected).
- young tourists of different gender about overall satisfaction by visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H3a was rejected).

The purpose of applying a one-way analysis of variance ANOVA is to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics about their push factors, pull factors and overall satisfaction by visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. One-way analysis of variance examined the accuracy of the H1b hypothesis: *There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning their push factors for visiting*

*cities in the Republic of Serbia.* It was found that there was no statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia because this hypothesis was rejected. Hypothesis H1c, which is: *There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different education concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia* was also rejected because there is a statistically significant difference between young tourists of different education concerning their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia only for one of the 11 push factors. Statistically significant difference exists for push factor *I wanted a whole new experience* ( $F=5.541$ ,  $p=0.005$ ) between young tourist with bachelor’s degree and young tourist with master degree.

Table 6: ANOVA according to the education and push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia

Push motives		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I wanted a whole new experience	Among Groups	14.328	2	7.164	5.541	.005
	Within Groups	139.636	108	1.293		
	Total	153.964	110			

Source: *Research results*

One-way analysis of variance examined the accuracy of the H1d hypothesis that there was a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different professional status about their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. The results of the one-way analysis of variance showed that there is not a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different professional status about their push factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia which is why hypothesis H1d rejected. Hypothesis H2b, which is: *There is a statistically significant difference among young tourists of different age concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia* was also rejected because a statistically significant difference was found only for one of 11 pull factors. Statistically significant difference exists for the pull factor *Natural attractions* ( $F= 4.663$ ;  $Sig.= 0.011$ ). This statistically significant difference exists between young tourist 18-21 and 26-19 years old and between young tourist 22-25 and 26-29 years old.

Table 7: ANOVA according to the age and pull motives for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia

Pull motives		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Natural attractions	Among Groups	11.108	2	5.554	4.663	.011
	Within Groups	128.640	108	1.191		
	Total	139.748	110			

Source: Research results

One-way analysis of variance ANOVA showed that there was no statistically significant difference among:

- young tourists of different education concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H2c was rejected).
- young tourists of different professional status concerning their pull factors for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H2d was rejected).
- young tourists of different age concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H3b was rejected).
- young tourists of different education concerning overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia (H3c was rejected).

Table 8: ANOVA according to the professional status and overall satisfaction by visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia

Overall satisfaction		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I am satisfied with the tour	Among Groups	5.800	2	2.900	3.357	.039
	Within Groups	93.300	108	.864		
	Total	99.099	110			
I have enjoyed myself with the tour	Among Groups	6.956	2	3.478	4.048	.020
	Within Groups	92.791	108	.859		
	Total	99.748	110			

Source: Research results

Hypothesis H3d was rejected because it was found that there was a statistically significant difference for 2 of the 6 statements: *I am satisfied with the tour* (F=3.357, p=0.039) and *I have enjoyed myself on the tour*

( $F=4.048$ ,  $p=0.020$ ). Statistically significant difference in these statements exists between respondents who are employed and respondents who are unemployed.

### **Conclusion**

The subject of this empirical study was to examine the motivation of young tourists for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia and their overall satisfaction. Based on the research results, we can conclude that various push and pull factors affect young tourists to visit cities in the Republic of Serbia. The results of this study indicate that young tourists primarily travel to spend time with friends and have fun, although the push motives as rest and relaxation, new experience and getting away from stress and daily routine are ranked below these reasons according to their importance. Cleanliness and orderliness of the city, good value for money, the services provided, cultural and historical heritage sites, rich gastronomy offer and additional facilities were rated as main pull motives for visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. Average ratings given by young tourists regarding their overall satisfaction showed that they are very satisfied with their visit to the cities in the Republic of Serbia. Results of t-test and one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) showed that none of the sub-hypotheses were proved. According to the research results, it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between young tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics concerning their push and pull factors as well as overall satisfaction with visiting cities in the Republic of Serbia. The main limitation of this study is the small number of respondents, so the major recommendation for future research is an increase in the number of respondents. Another recommendation for future research is examining the push and pull factors for visiting cities in Republic of Serbia of foreign young tourists.

### **References**

1. Antara, M., Prameswari, Y. A. (2018). Push and pull factors of tourists visit the tourism destination of Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 112-120.
2. Azman, I., Chan, J. (2010). Health and spa tourism business: Tourists' profiles and motivational factors in health, wellness and tourism: healthy tourists, healthy business?. *Proceedings of the Travel and Tourism Research Association Europe 2010*, Budapest, 9-24.

3. Boukas, N. (2013). Youth Visitors' Satisfaction in Greek Cultural Heritage Destinations: The Case of Delphi. *Tourism Planning & Development*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 285-306.
4. Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 97-116.
5. Carvache-Franco, M., Carvache-Franco, O., Carvache-Franco, W., Villagómez Buele, C., Arteaga Peñafiel, M. (2018). The tourist demand from the perspective of the motivation, assessment and satisfaction in a sun and beach destination: The Manta Case, Ecuador. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 561-572.
6. Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a Sociology of International Tourism. *Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 164-182.
7. Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations of pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 408-424.
8. Dann, G. M. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 184-194.
9. Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourism Motivations: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 187-219.
10. Demeter, T., Bratucu, G. (2014). Typologies of youth tourism. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Economic Sciences, Series V*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 115.
11. Ghețe, A. M. (2015). The importance of youth tourism. *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 688-694.
12. Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 283-304.
13. Han, H., Kim, W., Kiatkawsin, K. (2017). Emerging youth tourism: fostering young travelers' conservation intentions. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 34, No. 7, 905-918.
14. Horak, S., Weber, S. (2000). Youth tourism in Europe: Problems and prospects. *Tourism Recreation Research*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 37-44.

15. Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a Social Psychological Theory of Tourism Motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 256-262.
16. Jovanović Tončev, M., Podovac, M. (2016). A survey on factors influencing tourists' decision to visit spa destination. *The First International Scientific Conference "Tourism in Function of Development of the Republic of Serbia – Spa Tourism in Serbia and Experiences of Other Countries"*, Vrnjačka Banja, 1(1), 122-138.
17. Jovanović Tončev, M. J., Jovanović, D., Malićanin, M., Dimitrijević, B. (2016). Push and pull factors determining wine tourism development in the *Tri Morave* sub-region. *Economics of Agriculture*, Vol. 63, No. 3, 781-800.
18. Khoshpakyants, A. V., Vidishcheva, E. V. (2010). Challenges of youth tourism. *European researcher*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 101-103.
19. Kim Lian Chan, J., Baum, T. (2007). Motivation factors of ecotourists in ecolodge accommodation: The push and pull factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 349-364.
20. Kim, K., Oh, I. K., Jogaratnam, G. (2007). College student travel: A revised model of push motives. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 73-85.
21. Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K., Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism management*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 169-180.
22. Marchiori, E., Cantoni, L. (2018). Applying the counseling-learning approach to a tourism-related massive open online course. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 58-74.
23. Matzler, K., Siller, H. J. (2003). Linking travel motivations with perceptions of destinations: The case of youth travelers in Alpine summer and winter tourism. *Tourism Review*, Vol. 58, No. 4, 6-11.
24. Murray, E. J. (1964). *Motivation and emotion*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

25. Plog, S. C. (1974). Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 55-58.
26. Podovac, M., Đorđević, N., Milićević, S. (2019). Rural tourism in the function of life quality improvement of rural population on Goč mountain. *Economics of Agriculture*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 205-220.
27. Prasad, S., Nair, G. K., Purohit, H. (2019). Tourist Satisfaction: an Analysis of Push and Pull Factors - A Case of Qatar Tourism. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 187-199.
28. Preko, A., Doe, F., Dadzie, S. A. (2019). The future of youth tourism in Ghana: motives, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 5-21.
29. Pyo, S., Mihalik, J. B., Uysal, M. (1989). Attraction Attributes and Motivations: A Canonical Correlation Analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 277-282.
30. Salimon, M. G., Kareem, O., Mokhtar, S. S. M., Yusoff, R. Z. B., Gorondutse, A. H. (2019). Tourism intention: The empirical investigation of pull, push and perceived security factors in Nigeria. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 358-374.
31. Sari, N. P. R., Bendesa, K. G., Antara, M. (2019). The influence of quality of work life on employees' performance with job satisfaction and work motivation as intervening variables in star-rated hotels in Ubud tourism area of Bali. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 74-83.
32. Shin, Y. H., Severt, K., Fjelstul, J. (2017). RV traveler's pull factors to campgrounds in leisure tourism. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 493-508.
33. Todorović, N., Apelić, J., Romić, G. (2015). Characteristics of foreign youth tourism in Belgrade. *Bulletin of the Serbian geographical society*, Vol. 95, No. 3, 1-16.



34. Todorović, N., Jovičić, D. (2016). Motivational factors of youth tourists visiting Belgrade. *Journal of the Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijic" - SASA*, Vol. 66, No. 2, 273-289.
35. Uysal, M., Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull Factors. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 844-846.
36. Yoon, Y., Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 45-56.
37. Yousaf, A., Amin, I., Santos, C., Antonio, J. (2018). Tourist's motivations to travel: A theoretical perspective on the existing literature. *Tourism and hospitality management*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 197-211.
38. Wangari, C. (2017). Understanding the travel motivation among youth travelers in Kenya: the 'push' and 'pull' paradigm. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1-16.
39. Weber, K., Ali-Knight, J., Yolal, M., Woo, E., Cetinel, F., Uysal, M. (2012). Comparative research of motivations across different festival products. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 66-80.
40. Wen, J., Meng, F., Ying, T., Qi, H., Lockyer, T. (2018). Drug tourism motivation of Chinese outbound tourists: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 64, 233-244.
41. Wong, M., Cheung, R., Wan, C. (2013). A Study on Traveler Expectation, Motivation and Attitude. *Contemporary Management Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 169-186.
42. Šimková, E., Holzner, J. (2014). Motivation of Tourism Participants. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 159, 660-664.